



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,610	10/09/2001	Robert J. Beyers II	A-7280	6170

5642 7590 10/30/2006

SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
5030 SUGARLOAF PARKWAY  
LAWRENCEVILLE, GA 30044

EXAMINER

HOSSAIN, FARZANA E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/973,610

Applicant(s)

BEYERS ET AL.

Examiner

Farzana E. Hossain

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/01/06 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. This office action is in response to communications filed 09/01/2006. Claims 1, 4-38 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 24, 31, 34, 37 are amended. Claims 2 and 3 are cancelled. Claims 4, 5, 13, 26, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38 are previously presented. Claims 7-9, 11, 16, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27-30 are original.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 09/01/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues, "Wine does not disclose, teach or suggest at least that the content restriction enabling display of all the content except for particular media content of the plurality of media content" (Page 13).

In response to these arguments, Wine discloses that only thematically or contextually appropriate content is displayed (Page 3, paragraph 0031, Page 4, paragraph 0038, Page 4, paragraph 0042, Page 5, paragraph 0046). Therefore, if only appropriate content is displayed then particular content is not enabled to be displayed or the content restriction enabling display of all content except particular content such as inappropriate content (Page 3, paragraph 0031, Page 4, paragraph 0038, Page 4, paragraph 0042, Page 5, paragraph 0046).

Regarding Claims 10, 17, 21, 24, 31, 37 are argued similarly and their dependent claims and the response is the same as above. Claim 34 was not argued, however, the limitation was the same and if argued would have the same response as above.

The rejections are maintained.

4. The applicant also generally traverses all findings of inherency as not having been shown to be necessarily present as well as any findings of well known art and that the claim combinations are too complex to support such conclusions (Pages 22-23).

In response to the general traversal of all findings of inherency, The Microsoft Computer Dictionary (4<sup>th</sup> edition) defines logic – in programming, the assertions, assumptions and operations that define what a given program does. Defining the logic of a program is often the first step in developing the program's source code. Wine

Art Unit: 2623

discloses the method and performs the functions of independent claims 21, 24, 31, 34, and 37. As Wine performs these functions, the STS, the STS headend, the STS client device must include logic as otherwise the functions cannot be performed.

In response to the traversal of well known art for claim combinations. Claims 11-16 are rejected under 103 over Wine in view of Sahota. Wine discloses an audio-visual stream however is silent on the stream comprising a commercial. Sahota discloses that the audio-visual stream comprises a commercial. It is well known in the art that an audio-visual stream can include a commercial so as to provide viewers with advertisements for sponsors' products in order to cover production costs of the programming.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 4-10, 17-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wine et al (US 2002/0004839 and hereafter referred to as "Wine").

Regarding Claim 1, Wine discloses a method in a subscriber television system (STS) (Figure 5, 190), the method comprising the steps of: providing a plurality of media content instances to be displayed to a subscriber (Figure 5, Page 4, paragraph 0035, 0041); providing at least one trigger synchronized with a first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances (Page 5, paragraphs 0050, 0051); the at least one trigger comprising at least one unique identifier or synchronized timing information (Page 5, paragraph 0049), enabling at least one content restriction responsive to a reception of the at least one trigger or VBI token (Page 3, paragraph 0031, Page 4, paragraph 0038, Page 5, paragraphs 0045, 0050, 0051), the content restriction enabling display of all the content except for particular media content of the plurality of media content (Page 4, paragraphs 0038, 0039, Page 5, paragraphs 0043-0046, 0050, 0051).

Regarding Claim 10, Wine discloses a method in a STS (Figure 5, 190), the method comprising the steps of: providing a plurality of media content instances to be displayed to a subscriber (Figure 5, Page 4, paragraph 0035, 0041); providing at least one trigger synchronized with a first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances (Page 5, paragraphs 0050, 0051); the at least one trigger comprising at least one unique identifier or synchronized timing information (Page 5, paragraph 0049), enabling at least one content restriction responsive to a reception of the at least one trigger or VBI token (Page 3, paragraph 0031, Page 4, paragraph 0038, Page 5, paragraphs 0045, 0050, 0051). Wine discloses enabling at least one content control module in the web server (Figure 5, 208) which comprises a database or control file (Page 5, paragraphs 0048) of a plurality of values or time stamp values for plurality of

Art Unit: 2623

unique identifiers or synchronization timing information (Page 5, paragraphs 0047, 0050, 0051), the plurality of values being individually matched with a corresponding content restriction or restriction on displaying only appropriate content (Page 3, paragraph 0031, Page 4, paragraph 0038, Page 5, paragraphs 0045, 0050, 0051).

Although the methods are performed at a web server, Wine teaches that the control file can be sent to the client device for execution by the client device (Page 7, paragraph 0087, Figure 5, 210), which meets the limitation of the content control module in the client device comprising a database with values. Wine discloses that the content restriction enabling display of all the content except for particular media content of the plurality of media content (Page 4, paragraphs 0038, 0039, Page 5, paragraphs 0043-0046, 0050, 0051). Wine disclose receiving the at least one trigger at the client device (Page 5, paragraph 0045, 0047, 0048, Page 7, paragraph 0087); interpreting a value of the at least one trigger by the content control module (Page 5, paragraph 0047); and enabling the content control module to reference the database with the value (Page 7, paragraph 0087) and determine at least one enabled content restriction (Page 3, paragraph 0031, Page 4, paragraph 0038, Page 5, paragraphs 0045, 0050, 0051).

Regarding Claim 17, Wine discloses a method in a STS (Figure 5, 190), the method comprising the steps of: inserting, within an available insertion area in at least one transport stream (Page 4, paragraph 0042, Page 5, paragraph 0050), at least one trigger having at least one content restriction (Page 5, paragraphs 0043, 0046); the content restriction enabling display of all the content except for particular media content of the plurality of media content (Page 4, paragraphs 0038, 0039, Page 5, paragraphs

0043-0046, 0050, 0051), and distributing the at least one transport stream with the at least one trigger to a plurality of client devices (Page 3, paragraph 0028).

Regarding Claim 21, Wine discloses a method in a STS (Figure 5, 190), the method comprising the steps of: providing a plurality of media content instances to be displayed to a subscriber (Page 3, paragraph 0028), a first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances being a video stream and a second media content instance of the plurality of media content instances being a particular advertisement (Pages 4-5, paragraphs 0042, 0049- 0051); providing at least one trigger synchronized with a priority event or content being displayed in the video stream (Page 5, paragraphs 0047, 0050, 0051); enabling display of all media content instances except the particular advertisement or content which is not appropriate from being displayed simultaneously with the priority event in the video stream (Page 4, paragraphs 0038, 0039, Page 5, paragraphs 0043-0046, 0050, 0051).

Regarding Claims 24 and 34, Wine discloses a system in a STS (Figure 5, 208) and a system in a STS headend device (Figure 5, 208), the system comprising: a web server inserts VBI tokens into the audio visual stream using a retrieved control file to form an encoded multimedia stream that can transmit the stream to a web server (Page 5, paragraph 0050, 0051) which necessarily includes that the web server (Figure 5, 208) contain a processor as the server processes the control file stored in some form of memory (Page 4, paragraph 0034) to generate the encoded multimedia stream. Wine discloses the server providing at least one trigger synchronized with a first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances (Page 5, paragraphs 0050,



Art Unit: 2623

0051); the at least one trigger comprising at least one unique identifier or synchronized timing information (Page 5, paragraph 0049), enabling at least one content restriction responsive to a reception of the at least one trigger or VBI token (Page 3, paragraph 0031, Page 4, paragraph 0038, Page 5, paragraphs 0045, 0050, 0051), the content restriction enabling display of all the content except for particular media content of the plurality of media content (Page 4, paragraphs 0038, 0039, Page 5, paragraphs 0043-0046, 0050, 0051). The Microsoft Computer Dictionary (4<sup>th</sup> edition) defines logic – in programming, the assertions, assumptions and operations that define what a given program does. Defining the logic of a program is often the first step in developing the program's source code. Therefore, the web server must also contain logic for executing the above methods.

Regarding Claim 31, Wine teaches a system in a STS client device or personal computer (Figure 5, 210, Page 4, paragraph 0040). Wine comprises that VBI tokens and synchronization timing information are exported into a control file and the control file contains data needed by servlets and applets to control the browsers 210 executed by personal computers (Page 5, paragraphs 0048, Page 7, paragraph 0047). Therefore, the control file contains logic for controlling the browser and the personal computer STS client device contains a processor that executes the logic of the control file, where it is the control file is stored in storage or some form of memory when the client receives the control file (Page 2, paragraphs 0015, 0016, Page 7, paragraph 0087). Wine also teaches that the STS client device comprises logic configured to provide a plurality of media content instance to be displayed to a subscriber as the web browser displays the

Art Unit: 2623

audio-visual stream together with the accompanying content to the viewer. Wine teaches the server comprises logic providing at least one trigger synchronized with a first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances (Page 5, paragraphs 0050, 0051); the at least one trigger comprising at least one unique identifier or synchronized timing information (Page 5, paragraph 0049), enabling at least one content restriction responsive to a reception of the at least one trigger or VBI token (Page 3, paragraph 0031, Page 4, paragraph 0038, Page 5, paragraphs 0045, 0050, 0051), the content restriction enabling display of all the content except for particular media content of the plurality of media content (Page 4, paragraphs 0038, 0039, Page 5, paragraphs 0043-0046, 0050, 0051). Wine teaches that the logic can be sent to the client for execution (Page 7, paragraph 0087). The Microsoft Computer Dictionary (4<sup>th</sup> edition) defines logic – in programming, the assertions, assumptions and operations that define what a given program does. Defining the logic of a program is often the first step in developing the program's source code. Therefore, the client can process the logic that the web server can perform as discussed in claims 1 and 24.

Regarding Claims 37, Wine discloses a system in a STS headend (Figure 5, 208), the system comprising: a web server inserts VBI tokens into the audio visual stream using a retrieved control file to form an encoded multimedia stream that can transmit the stream to a web server (Page 5, paragraph 0050, 0051) which necessarily includes that the web server (Figure 5, 208) contain a processor as the server processes the control file stored in some form of memory or database (Page 4, paragraph 0034) to generate the encoded multimedia stream. Wine discloses the

Art Unit: 2623

server providing at least one trigger synchronized with a first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances (Page 5, paragraphs 0050, 0051). See rejection of Claims 24 and 34. Wine teaches the logic configured to allow the STS headend to receive and distribute at least one transport stream or multimedia stream or audiovisual stream to a plurality of client devices (Page 3, paragraph 0028). Wine teaches that the STS headend or web server is configured to receive audio-visual steam or transport stream from data servlet (Figure 5, 206) (Page 5, paragraph 0050) and that the headend communicates with client devices or personal computers executing web applications (Page 4, paragraph 0040, Figure 5, 210) and transmits the encoded transport streams to the web browsers (Figure 5, 210). Wine discloses that headend comprises an administrative content control module or unit that encodes VBI tokens into an audiovisual stream (Page 5, paragraphs 0048-0051). Wine also teaches that the web server enables at least one trigger to be synchronized with an available insertion area in the transport area in the transport stream (Page 5, paragraph 0050), the at least one trigger or VBI token comprising at least one content restriction (Page 3, paragraph 0031, Page 4, paragraph 0038, Page 5, paragraphs 0045, 0050, 0051), the content restriction enabling display of all the content except for particular media content of the plurality of media content (Page 4, paragraphs 0038, 0039, Page 5, paragraphs 0043-0046, 0050, 0051). The Microsoft Computer Dictionary (4<sup>th</sup> edition) defines logic – in programming, the assertions, assumptions and operations that define what a given program does. Defining the logic of a program is often the first step in developing the

program's source code. Therefore, the web server must also contain logic for executing the above methods.

Regarding Claims 4, 27, 32 and 35, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claims 1, 24, 31 and 34 respectively. Wine discloses VBI tokens at the appropriate locations in the audio-visual streams using synchronized timing information in the control file to synchronize the presentation of the accompanying content with the presentation of the audio-visual content (Page 5, paragraphs 0046, 0047, 0050). Wine discloses the at least one content restriction requires a second media content instance of the plurality of media content instances to be excluded from display for a time period or second media content that is contextually appropriate to the audio-visual stream is displayed during the current presentation of the audio-visual stream or content that does not correspond to the audio-visual stream is excluded during the display of the audio-visual stream or until the audio-visual stream changes or the excluded simultaneously with the first media content (Pages 4-5, paragraphs 0042, 0050).

Regarding Claim 5, 28, 33 and 36, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claims 4, 27, 32 and 35 respectively. See rejection of Claim 4. Wine discloses wherein the time period is equal to the length of the display of the first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances or the time of exclusion equals to the time for displaying the current VBI token contextually relating to the audio visual stream because the accompanying VBI tokens would be displayed instead of the current VBI token when the context of the audio-visual stream changes (Pages 4-5, paragraphs 0042, 0046, 0050) and wherein the particular second media content instance of the plurality of

Art Unit: 2623

media content instances is excluded from display during the display of the first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances (Pages 4-5, paragraphs 0042, 0046, 0050).

Regarding Claim 6, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Wine discloses further comprising the step of: implementing the at least one content restriction to be a hierarchy of at least one inclusive content restriction or restricting accompanying content that is contextually appropriate to the audio-visual stream to be included Page 3, paragraphs 0030-0031, Page 4, paragraphs 0034, 0038); and at least one exclusive content restriction or restricting accompanying content that is not contextually appropriate to the audio-visual stream to be excluded and also if no thematically available content is located in the ad server, it is retrieved from another source so that non-thematically appropriate content is excluded from being displayed (Page 3, paragraphs 0030-0031, Page 4, paragraphs 0034, 0038). Wine discloses enabling the at least one inclusive content restriction to require the display, if available, of a second media content instance of the plurality of media content instances designated by the at least one inclusive content restriction (Page 4, paragraph 0034); and enabling the at least one exclusive content restriction if the particular second media content instance of the plurality of media content instances is not available (Page 3, paragraphs 0030-0031, Page 4, paragraphs 0034, 0038), the at least one content restriction allowing the display of any of the plurality of media content instances not particularly excluded by the exclusive content restriction (Page 4, paragraph 0034, 0035, 0038).

Regarding Claims 7 and 29, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 24 respectively. Wine discloses the at least one trigger includes the at least one content restriction (Page 3, paragraph 0031, Pages 4-5, paragraphs 0042, 0046, 0047, 0050, 0051).

Regarding Claim 8, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Wine discloses the at least one trigger comprises information indicating the location of at least one media content instance needed to satisfy the at least one content restriction (Page 5, paragraphs 0050, 0051, Page 3, paragraph 0030).

Regarding Claims 9 and 30, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 24 respectively. Wine discloses the at least one trigger comprises at least one media content instance needed to satisfy the at least one content restriction ((Page 5, paragraphs 0050, 0051, Page 3, paragraphs 0030, 0031).

Regarding Claim 18, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claim 17. Wine discloses at least one content restriction excludes the insertion of at least one designated media content instance and wherein the designated media content instance is excluded from the available insertion area in the at least one transport stream or only appropriately content are inserted into the available inserting area such that if the content is not appropriate they are excluded from display (Pages 3-5, paragraph 0030-0034, 0038, 0042, 0046, 0050, 0051).

Regarding Claim 19, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claim 18. Wine discloses the at least one designated media content instance is a local commercial or the advertisements are based on the location (Page 5, paragraph 0046).

Regarding Claim 20, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claim 17. Wine discloses the at least one content restriction is an exclusive content restriction requiring the exclusion of at least one designated media content instance (Pages 3-5, paragraph 0030-0034, 0038, 0042, 0046, 0050, 0051).

Regarding Claim 22, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claim 21. Wine discloses the advertisement is selectable by the subscriber or according to user preferences (Page 5, paragraph 0046, Page 6, paragraph 0055).

Regarding Claim 23, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claim 21. Wine discloses the advertisement is an image of a scene item, and wherein the priority event is a scene displayed in the video stream where the scene item is represented or contextually appropriate to the audio-visual stream based on the timing of the presentation to synchronize the accompanying content (Page 3, paragraph 0025, Page 4, paragraph 0038 Page 5, paragraph 0050).

Regarding Claim 25, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claim 24. Wine discloses the least one content restriction requires a second media content instance of the plurality of media content instances to be displayed for a time period (Page 3, paragraph 0030, Page 5, paragraphs 0047, 0050).

Regarding Claim 26, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claim 25. Wine discloses the time period is equal to the length of the display of the first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances or displaying accompanying content or second media content for the time it is triggered to the time new first media content is displayed (Page 3, paragraph 0030, Page 5, paragraphs 0047, 0050). Wine discloses

Art Unit: 2623

the second media content instance of the plurality of media content instances is displayed simultaneously with the first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances as the second media content is triggered to be displayed with the first media content or audio visual stream and the second media content is displayed with content to which it corresponds at the time it is playing (Page 3, paragraph 0030, Page 5, paragraphs 0047, 0050).

Regarding Claim 38, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claim 37. Wine discloses the at least one content restriction excludes the insertion of at least one designated media content or restricting accompanying content that is not contextually appropriate to the audio-visual stream to be excluded and also if no thematically available content is located in the ad server, it is retrieved from another source so that non-thematically appropriate content is excluded from being displayed (Page 3, paragraphs 0030-0031, Page 4, paragraphs 0034, 0038) and wherein the administrative content control module allows the insertion of the least one designated media content into the available insertion area in the transport stream (Page 3, paragraphs 0030-0031, Page 4, paragraphs 0034, 0038).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the



Art Unit: 2623

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wine in view of Sahota (US 2002/0010928).

Regarding Claim 11, Wine discloses all the limitations of Claim 10. Wine discloses the client device displays a screen display comprising an application interface (Figure 4, 32), an advertisement banner (Figure 4, 36), and a video stream, the video stream displaying a first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances (Page 4, paragraphs 0034, 0036, 0038). Wine is silent on the first media content instance of the plurality of media content instances being a commercial. Sahota discloses a television or TV can receive and display Internet advertisement content integrated with TV commercial (Page 3, paragraph 0036, Page 1, paragraphs 0016, 0017). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wine to include the first media content to be a commercial (Page 3, paragraph 0036, Page 1, paragraphs 0016, 0017) as taught by Sahota in order to save production time of the broadcasters (Page 1, paragraph 0005) as disclosed by Sahota and to provide viewers with advertisements for sponsors' products in order to cover production costs of the programming.

Regarding Claim 12, Wine and Sahota disclose all the limitations of Claim 11. Wine teaches the content restriction excludes the display of the second media content instance of the plurality of media content instances in the advertisement banner (Pages 3-5, paragraph 0030-0034, 0038, 0042, 0046, 0050, 0051).

Regarding Claim 13, Wine and Sahota disclose all the limitations of Claim 12. Wine discloses wherein the second media content instance of the plurality of media content instances is associated with a competitor funding entity of the commercial or if only accompanying content can be of the same sponsor such as the Toronto Maple Leafs can be displayed if the funding entity is another entity it is contextually appropriate and will be excluded (Page 4, paragraphs 0038, 0039).

Regarding Claim 14, Wine and Sahota disclose all the limitations of Claim 11. Wine discloses the enabled content restriction is allows the display of any of the plurality of media content instances in the advertisement banner not excluded by the exclusive content restriction (Pages 3-5, paragraph 0030-0034, 0038, 0042, 0046, 0050, 0051).

Regarding Claim 15, Wine and Sahota disclose all the limitations of Claim 14. Wine discloses wherein at least one of the plurality of media content instances excluded by the content restriction is media content associated with a competitor of a funding entity of the commercial or if only accompanying content can be of the same sponsor such as the Toronto Maple Leafs can be displayed if the funding entity is another entity it is contextually appropriate and will be excluded (Page 4, paragraphs 0038, 0039).

Regarding Claim 16, Wine and Sahota disclose all the limitations of Claim 11. Wine discloses that the enabled content restriction is an inclusive/exclusive combination content restriction (Pages 3-5, paragraph 0030-0034, 0038, 0042, 0046, 0050, 0051), and wherein the inclusive/exclusive combination content restriction requires the display of a second media content instance of the plurality of media content instances in the

Art Unit: 2623

advertisement banner if available (Pages 3-5, paragraph 0030-0034, 0038, 0042, 0046, 0050, 0051), the second media content instance of the plurality of media content instances being associated with a funding entity of the commercial (Page 4, paragraphs 0038, 0039), if the second of the media content is not available, then the inclusive/exclusive combination content restriction requires the display of a third of the plurality of media content instances in the advertisement banner, the third of the plurality of media content instances being any media content not associated with a competitor of a funding entity of the commercial (Page 4, paragraphs 0038, 0039). See rejections of Claims 13 and 15.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farzana E. Hossain whose telephone number is 571-272-5943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FEH

October 19, 2006



CHRIS KELLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600